

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

D.T.E. 99-271

Respondent: Julie A. Canny

Title: Executive Director

Respondent: Beth Abesamis

Title: Director – Wholesale Performance Assurance

REQUEST: Department of Telecommunications and Energy, Record Requests

DATED: August 23, 2000

ITEM: DTE RR 325 (1) Please identify metrics, adopted in both New York and Massachusetts, not yet reported by Verizon. (2) Indicate when Verizon will begin collecting data for and reporting these metrics in both states.

REPLY: C2C metrics that are under development (UD) are listed on the attached pages. The listed metrics are under development in both Massachusetts and New York and, when the data is available, both states will be reported for the same month. The scheduled performance period to be reported is noted on the attachment.

The C2C guidelines as written provide a comprehensive reporting of Verizon's wholesale service performance. The majority of the metrics under development are disaggregations of metrics being reported in the C2C today. In addition, as the industry evolves metrics will continue to be developed and/or deleted in order to measure relevant performance areas.

NET RR# 141

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

D.T.E. 99-271

Respondent: R. Michael Toothman

Title: Director-CLEC Communication

REQUEST: Department of Telecommunications and Energy, Record Requests

DATED: August 23, 2000

ITEM: DTE RR 329 Please comment on the likelihood that Level 5 “cut through” processing for Platform services will be implemented in December, 2000. In addition, please indicate what factors, if any, may cause Verizon to miss this scheduled implementation date.

REPLY: Verizon will implement the Level 5 “cut through” processing for Platform services in December 2000, if the following conditions are met:

- 1) No unforeseen design issues are uncovered as detail design for the project is completed.
- 2) The implementation plan and business rule changes are agreed to by the CLEC community.
- 3) No unforeseen regulatory mandated issues occur which require a significant amount of resources to be expended prior to the December 2000 release.

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

D.T.E. 99-271

Respondent: Brian Barry

Title: Manager-Wholesale Customer Care

REQUEST: Department of Telecommunications and Energy, Record Requests

DATED: August 23, 2000

ITEM: DTE RR 333 In response to information provided by AT&T in DTE-ATT 1-4(f) (indicating Verizon erroneously rejected 138 AT&T production test orders because of TISOC errors), Verizon stated during the August 22, 2000, technical session that 81 of those 138 orders were, in fact, valid queries (because AT&T requested: a feature not available in Massachusetts, expedites with a due dates longer than the standard due-date interval, and an invalid due date interval). Please provide to AT&T and the Department information comparable to what AT&T provided in its attached response to DTE-ATT 1-4(f) for those 81 orders.

REPLY: In response to DTE-ATT 1-4f, AT&T provided a list of orders which it claimed had been improperly rejected. Of this list of 189 orders, AT&T claimed that 138 orders had been improperly rejected by the TISOC. However, Verizon's analysis indicates that 81 of these 138 orders were properly rejected by the TISOC. The attached list identifies these 81 PONs and the reason that they were rejected. The attachment is considered CLEC-specific proprietary information. A copy is being provided under terms of the Protective Order only to the Department and AT&T. The column labeled "category" provides a brief description of the reason that the PON was queried. As shown on the attached chart, 41 PONs were rejected for an invalid Universal Service Order Code ("USOC"). On each of these orders, AT&T requested a USOC "NST". NST is a USOC for a Vermont PhoneSmart feature and is not a valid USOC for a Massachusetts order. 39 PONS were rejected because of an improper request for an expedite. On each of these orders, AT&T requested a due date longer than the standard interval but also requested an expedite. In this situation, a request for an expedite is not appropriate. In order to resolve the conflicting information, the Verizon representative needed to query the order to determine if AT&T wanted a longer than standard due date or an expedited due date.

REPLY: DTE RR 333 (cont'd) One PON was queried because AT&T requested an invalid due date. This order came into the TISOC on a Friday afternoon, after 3 p.m. which according to the interval guidelines is treated as if the order is treated as if received the following day. On Monday, Verizon provided the correct 4 business day interval for adding hunting.

NET RR# 147

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

D.T.E. 99-271

Respondent: Richard Sampson

Title: Director

REQUEST: Department of Telecommunications and Energy, Record Requests

DATED: August 23, 2000

ITEM: DTE RR 336 In DTE-ATT 1-11(a), AT&T states that out of 902 test calls made during AT&T's production test, only 226 were accurately reported to AT&T on the Access DUF records. In response, Verizon indicated during the technical sessions that its review of 100 of these 902 calls (55 random, 45 of one entire call set) show that all 100 were "found on the DUF" (see Tr. at 2787). Please confirm that these 100 calls were recorded accurately on the DUF and please provide the documentation demonstrating that these 100 calls were, indeed, accurately recorded.

REPLY: In response to DTE-ATT 1-11(a), AT&T stated that out of the 902 test calls made during its production test, only 226 were accurately reported on its access DUF. Verizon randomly selected and reviewed 100 calls, out of the 676 calls that AT&T claimed were missing. The selection included a sample of all 5 call types included on AT&T's list. To correct the transcript at page 2915, forty-one of the sampled 100 calls were 900 calls and 59 were randomly selected.

The attached spreadsheet details the findings of Verizon's review. The spreadsheet contains data which is CLEC-specific proprietary information. A copy is being provided under terms of the Protective Order only to the Department and AT&T. The attachment provides the details of the 100 calls selected and specifies the Julian cycle, which identifies the date that the DUF was sent (Column G). For example, January 1st, or the first day of the year, is C001, and February 1st, or the 32nd day of the year, is C032. The DUFs were sent to AT&T via Connect:Direct. Column H: contains some additional information about certain calls on the spreadsheet. Verizon was able to locate 99 of the 100 calls. According to the Verizon-MA switch, which records a record of all telephone calls originated from the central office, the call, displayed on line 29, was not made.

NET RR# 150

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

D.T.E. 99-271

Respondent: Richard Sampson

Title: Director

REQUEST: Department of Telecommunications and Energy, Record Requests

DATED: August 23, 2000

ITEM: DTE RR 337 Please provide a copy of the e-mail sent to AT&T on May 26, 2000, containing the list of six telephone numbers requiring an AT&T disconnect order (see Tr. 2787, Tr. 2917-2918).

REPLY: A copy of the e-mail, which was actually sent on May 22, 2000, not May 26th, and a copy of the Excel spreadsheet which was associated with the e-mail are attached. This e-mail and the spreadsheet are CLEC-specific proprietary information. A copy is being provided under terms of the Protective Order only to the Department and AT&T.

As stated in the transcript at page 2917, AT&T has not issued disconnect orders for these six telephone numbers.

NET RR# 151

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

D.T.E. 99-271

Respondent: Kathleen McLean

Title: Vice President

REQUEST: Department of Telecommunications and Energy, Record Requests

DATED: August 23, 2000

ITEM: DTE RR 339 Of the 5,000 UNE-P LSRs Verizon-Massachusetts received in July, how many of those orders were submitted via EDI, were for residential customers (and indicate how many of those were submitted via EDI), and were for new orders.

REPLY: Of the 5,000 UNE-P LSRs Verizon-Massachusetts received in July 2000, four were submitted via EDI. The data, retained by Verizon, associated with the 5,000 UNE-P LSRs is not available by residence and business class of service. The number for new orders (new is defined as activity code = "N" on the LSR), was 54.

NET RR# 153

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

D.T.E. 99-271

Respondent: Marilyn Devito

Title: Director – Program One

REQUEST: Department of Telecommunications and Energy, Record Requests

DATED: August 23, 2000

ITEM: DTE RR 342 Please provide to the Department CLEC-specific flow-through and reject rates and order volumes from July 1999 to the present.

REPLY: The attached spreadsheets provide CLEC-specific flow-through and reject rates and order volumes from July 1999 through June 2000. This information is CLEC-specific proprietary data and will be made available to the Department pursuant to the Protective Order.

NET RR# 156

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

D.T.E. 99-271

Respondent: R. Michael Toothman

Title: Director-CLEC Communication

REQUEST: Department of Telecommunications and Energy, Record Requests

DATED: August 23, 2000

ITEM: DTE RR 344 Please see Tr. at 2995-2997: Please provide copies of Verizon flash announcements that were generated as a result of WorldCom's pre-order, order, and testing issue logs, which it provided to Verizon.

REPLY: Of the 374 issues identified on WCOM's order, preorder, and testing logs only 5% resulted in Type 1 (flash) bulletins. Copies of the 19 bulletins are attached.

NET RR# 158